

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 020558

63

ORIGIN IO-11

INFO OCT-01 AF-06 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-04 H-02

INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15

ARA-06 EA-07 NEA-10 USIE-00 INRE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00

SAM-01 /094 R

DRAFTED BY IO/UNP:JFTEFFT

APPROVED BY P/MR. SISCO

IO/SWLEWIS

AF/WSCHAUFEELE

S/S:FORTIZ

----- 056093

O P 280025Z JAN 76

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION USUN NEW YORK IMMEDIATE

INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY PRETORIA

AMEMBASSY LUSAKA

AMCONSUL CAPE TOWN

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 020558

E.O. 11652:GDS

TAGS:PFOR, UN, SC, FF, WK, FR

SUBJECT:UN SECURITY COUNCIL DEBATE ON NAMIBIA

REF: A) USUN 215; B) USUN 251; C) STATE 18113

1. DEPARTMENT HAS CAREFULLY STUDIED DRAFT RESOLUTION ON
NAMIBIA PRESENTED BY AFRICAN GROUP (REFTEL A) AND SUGGESTED
CHANGES OF BRITISH AND FRENCH (REFTEL B).

2. IN VIEW OF INCREASING LIKELIHOOD THAT NAMIBIA DEBATE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 020558

WILL FOCUS ON ANGOLA WE ARE WARY OF EFFORTS TO MODERATE

AFRICAN DRAFT AT THIS TIME. WE PREFER TO WAIT AND SEE WHAT TENOR THE DEBATE TAKES AND THEN TO GAUGE THE POLITICAL CLIMATE BEFORE COMMITTING OURSELVES TO SPECIFIC LANGUAGE. WE BELIEVE IT ESSENTIAL THAT WE, BRITISH AND FRENCH REMAIN UNITED IN OUR APPROACH TO A NAMIBIA RESOLUTION AND PARTICULARLY WISH TO AVOID HAVING ANY OF THREE TRAPPED INTO SUPPORTING SPECIFIC LANGUAGE WHICH IN CONTEXT OF NORMAL NAMIBIAN DEBATE WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE BUT IN WAKE OF A BITTER DEBATE OVER ANGOLA COULD BE CONSTRUED AS BEING A ONE-SIDED CONDEMNATION OF SOUTH AFRICA'S ROLE IN ANGOLA.

3. AS EXAMPLE OF OUR PROBLEM, REPETITION OF LANGUAGE SIMILAR TO THAT IN RESOLUTION 301 (1971), WHICH IN NORMAL CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD HAVE OUR SUPPORT, COULD IN THE WAKE OF A SHARP EXCHANGE ON ANGOLA DEBATE BE MISCONSTRUED AS HITTING SOLELY SOUTH AFRICA ON ANGOLA. SAME IS TRUE FOR CONDEMNATION OF SOUTH AFRICA'S ESTABLISHMENT AND UTILIZATION OF MILITARY BASES IN NAMIBIA, WHICH WOULD NORMALLY BE LOGICAL EXTENSION OF OUR VIEW THAT SOUTH AFRICA'S PRESENCE IN NAMIBIA IS ILLEGAL. WE BELIEVE THAT IF THE UNSC IS TO TAKE ON ANGOLA IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NAMIBIAN DEBATE, IT SHOULD NOT RPT NOT MAKE ANY ONE-SIDED CONDEMNATION OF SOUTH AFRICA, A STEP THAT EVEN OAU DID NOT TAKE IN ITS RECENT SUMMIT. WE BELIEVE THAT SUCH A CONDEMNATION AT THE UN COULD UNDERCUT AFRICAN MODERATES AND FURTHER ERODE OPPOSITION TO MPLA IN AFRICA.

4. MISSION IS INSTRUCTED, THEREFORE, TO INFORM BRITISH AND FRENCH OF OUR APPREHENSIONS OVER ANGOLA AS STATED IN PARA 2. ARRIVAL OF MPLA REPS ADDS TO THESE APPREHENSIONS. YOU SHOULD INFORM BRITISH AND FRENCH THAT WE BELIEVE THAT THEY SHOULD CONSULT CLOSELY WITH MODERATE AFRICANS SUCH AS SENEGAL, ZAMBIA, IVORY COAST AND ZAIRE BEFORE THEY MOVE TOO QUICKLY TO SEEK SUPPORT FOR THEIR CHANGES TO THE NAMIBIA RESOLUTION. YOU SHOULD STATE THAT THE US CANNOT AT PRESENT SUPPORT EITHER BRITISH AND FRENCH CHANGES. REVISED BRITISH DRAFT HAS A CLEAR ONE-SIDED REFERENCE TO ANGOLA ABOUT WHICH WE HAVE SERIOUS
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 020558

DOUBTS AS CONCLUSION TO A BITTER ANGOLA DEBATE IN WHICH SOUTH AFRICA AND MPLA PARTICIPATE. WE BELIEVE WE COULD ACCEPT THE FRENCH REVISION OF OPERATIVE PARAGRAPHS IN A STRICTLY NAMIBIA CONTEXT BUT RESERVE JUDGMENT ON WHETHER WE COULD ACCEPT IT IF ANGOLA IS DISCUSSED. THE FRENCH AND BRITISH SHOULD ALSO BE CAUTIONED NOT TO SUGGEST TO ANY OTHER DELEGATIONS THAT THE US COULD SUPPORT THEIR REVISIONS OF THE AFRICAN DRAFT.

5. YOU SHOULD ALSO TELL BRITISH AND FRENCH THAT WE BELIEVE THAT PHRASE IN OPERATIVE PARA 7 OF THE AFRICAN DRAFT WHICH INCLUDES NAMIBIAN CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE AMONG CONDEMNATION OF FURTHER ATTEMPTS BY SOUTH AFRICA TO EVADE UN DEMAND FOR FREE ELECTIONS IN NAMIBIA SHOULD BE DELETED. WE PREFER NOT TO HASTILY CONDEMN CONFERENCE WHICH, IF NAMIBIAN POLITICAL GROUPS WERE ALLOWED TO PARTICIPATE, COULD BECOME A SIGNIFICANT STEP IN THE SELF-DETERMINATION PROCESS IN NAMIBIA.

6. LASTLY, YOU SHOULD TELL BRITISH AND FRENCH THAT WE INTEND TO USE SUBSTANCE OF OUR TRIPARTITE DEMARC;E TO SOUTH AFRICA ON OCTOBER 23 IN OUR SPEECH DURING SC MEETING ON NAMIBIA. KISSINGER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: AGREEMENT DRAFT, NAMIBIA, UNSC RESOLUTIONS, FOREIGN POLICY POSITION
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 28 JAN 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976STATE020558
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: JFTEFFT
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760031-0537
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760113/aaaaakzr.tel
Line Count: 130
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN IO
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 76 STATE 18113
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 22 APR 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <22 APR 2004 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <12 AUG 2004 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: N SECURITY COUNCIL DEBATE ON NAMIBIA
TAGS: PFOR, WA, FR, US, UN, UNSC
To: USUN NEW YORK
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006